

GEORGE H. PENDLETON,

THE COPPERHEAD CANDIDATE

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

His hostility to the American Republic illustrated by his record as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the State of Ohio.

WASHINGTON, D. C.:
PUBLISHED BY THE UNION CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.
1864.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from

The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

THE COPPERHEAD CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

GEORGE H. PENDLETON, now the candidate, of a party in full sympathy with existing rebellion, for the second office in the gift of the American people, has persistently pursued in Congress that course most calculated to encourage the armed enemies of the country, and to foster secession and treason of all kinds and grades.

We therefore accuse him upon the face of his record as a public man,

Who has consented to a division of the country.

Who has opposed the raising of armies to suppress the rebellion.

Who has opposed the raising of revenues and loans to support our armies, to pay the interest on the public debt, and maintain the public credit.

Who has opposed the punishment of armed traitors and defended their property and other interests.

Who has endeavored to shield the unarmed traitors and spies in the loyal States from the consequences of their crimes, by preventing the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, which suspension is provided by the Constitution to meet the case of such criminals.

Who has endeavored in all his public acts to prevent any injury to the institution of slavery, which is the cause of all the expense, suffering, and bloodshed that has befallen the country during the last three years.

Who has been crying Peace! when he well knew that peace could only come by compelling the rebels to yield to lawful authority or by a division of the country.

Who has invited the intervention of the Mon-

archs of Europe in our domestic troubles by opposing every declaration of Congress against it.

Who has opposed legislation to maintain the constitutional guarantee of a republican form of government to States whose recognized governments had been overthrown by a powerful and unlawful organization.

Who has in many ways endeavored to embarrass and hinder the constituted authorities in their efforts to vindicate the Union and Constitution from the attacks of rebels and traitors.

And for the truth of this accusation, we appeal to the record of his public acts.

Mr. Vallandigham, in 1861, introduced in Congress a resolution to amend the Constitution, which might more justly be called a resolution to encourage and legalize secession, from which the following are extracts:

ARTICLE XIII.

SECTION 1. The United States are divided into four sections as follows:

The States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and all new States annexed and admitted into the Union, or formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any of said States, or by the junction of two or more of the same or of parts thereof, or out of territory acquired north of said States, shall constitute one section, to be known as the NORTH.

The States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Kansas, and all new States annexed or admitted into the Union, or erected within the jurisdiction of any of said States, or by the junction of two or more of the same or of parts thereof or out of territory now held or hereafter acquired north of latitude thirty-six degrees thirty minutes and east of the crest of the Rocky mountains, shall constitute another section, to be known as the WEST.

The States of Oregon and California, and all new States annexed and admitted into the Union, or formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any of said States, or by the junction of two or more of the same or of parts thereof, or out of territory now held or hereafter acquired west of the crest of the Rocky mountains and of the Rio Grande, shall constitute another section, to be known as the PACIFIC.

The States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Car-

olina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri, and all new States annexed and admitted into the Union, or formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any of said States, or by the junction of two or more of the same or of parts thereof, or out of territory acquired east of the Rio Grande and south of latitude thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, shall constitute another section, to be known as the SOUTH.

ARTICLE XIV.

No State shall secede without the consent of the Legislatures of all the States of the section to which the State proposing to secede belongs. The President shall have power to adjust with seceding States all questions arising by reason of their secession; but the terms of adjustment shall be submitted to the Congress for their approval before the same shall be valid.

Mr. Pendleton could see nothing wrong in these propositions, and as late as January, 1863, defended them in the House.

At the session of Congress beginning in December, 1862, he opposed, in all its stages, the bill "to raise additional soldiers for the service of the Government."

He, with other Copperheads, in the House of Representatives, on the 28th of January, 1863, succeeded, by motions "to adjourn," "to lay on the table," for "a call of the House," "to excuse members for not voting," &c., &c., in preventing the House from coming to a vote on that bill, until, having sat all night, it adjourned at half past five on the morning of the 29th. The vote on the final passage of the bill, was reached February 2, 1863, when he voted against the bill.

At the same session he opposed, in all its stages, the bill "for enrolling and calling out the national forces, and for other purposes," and voted against the bill on its final passage, February 25, 1863.

And at the last session of Congress, he opposed, in all its stages, the bill to amend the act, calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasion, and pursued the same course on all bills relating to the same subject.

January 11, 1864, he voted against the following:

Whereas the burden of government should be made to fall as nearly equally as possible upon all parts of the country; and whereas the southern portion of the country has for several years contributed little, either in men or money, toward the support of the Government; and whereas almost the only way to get men from that portion is to take black men; and whereas for every black man enlisted in the South some man in the overburdened North may be exempted from the draft.

It is therefore hereby declared to be the sense of this house that the Government should use its most strenuous efforts to procure the voluntary enlistment of persons claimed as slaves in the rebel territory, by giving them the full bounty and pay of other soldiers, and by guaranteeing their freedom, at once, upon enlistment.

And during the last session, by many other votes,

endeavored to prevent the filling up of our armies.

He has opposed, in every way known to legislative filibusters, the passage of bills for raising a revenue sufficient to pay the army and navy, and provide them with the means necessary to prosecute the war.

July 10, 1861, in company with Vallandigham, Voorhees, Wood, and six others of like stripe, he voted against the bill further to provide for the collection of duties, imports, and other purposes.

July 29, 1861, he voted against the bill to provide additional revenues for defraying the expenses of Government, and maintaining public credit.

August 2, 1861, he voted against the bill reported by a committee of conference of the two Houses to provide increased revenues from imports to pay the interest on the public debt, and for other purposes.

February 7, 1862, he voted against the bill to authorize the issue of United States notes, and for the redemption and funding thereof, and for funding the floating debt of the United States.

April 8, 1862, with Vallandigham, Voorhees, and twelve others, he voted against the passage of the bill to provide internal revenue to support the Government and pay the interest on the public debt.

June 24, 1862, he voted against the bill "to authorize the issue of demand Treasury notes."

July 14, 1862, he voted against the bill "to impose an additional duty on sugars produced in the United States."

He has opposed all propositions to confiscate property of rebels, whether used for insurrectionary purposes or not.

August 2, 1861, he voted to lay on the table the bill to confiscate property used for insurrectionary purposes.

August 3, again voted to lay the bill on the table, and on the same day voted against the bill on its final passage.

At the session beginning December, 1861, he voted, May 26, 1862, against the House bill 471, to confiscate the property of rebels for the payment of the expenses of the present rebellion, and for other purposes.

July 15, 1862, he opposed Mr. Maynard's resolution explanatory of "An act to suppress rebellion, to punish treason and insurrection, to

seize and confiscate property of rebels, and for other purposes."

June 4th, 1862, he voted against the bill declaring disloyal persons ineligible to office.

June 9th, 1862, he voted against the following resolution:

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this House, the Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy of the United States should instruct all of his officers, holding command in districts of country in rebellion against the Government, to make proclamation that henceforth the armies of the Republic shall be subsisted, so far as practicable, upon the property of all those who are in rebellion, or are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States.

January 12th, 1863, he voted against the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and are hereby, instructed to inquire into the expediency and necessity of granting a bounty land warrant of 160 acres of land to every soldier now serving in our army, or who may hereafter enlist in any of the old regiments, the land warrants to be located on any confiscated rebel plantation which the holder of the warrant may select, as soon as the war is ended and the rebellion crushed, and report by bill or otherwise.

He opposed the bill to provide for the collection of abandoned property, and for the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States. He moved, March 3d, 1863, to lay the bill on the table; and by a multitude of other votes has opposed any punishment of the rebels now in arms against the Government.

He opposed the bill "to indemnify the President and other persons for suspending the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus*," and voted against the bill on its passage in the House, December 8th, 1863.

He opposed all efforts of the two Houses to agree on the details of the bill, and finally voted against agreeing to the report of the committee of conference, March 2d, 1863, and has opposed every proposition for the suspension of the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* in the cases which, if any, the constitutional provision was intended to cover.

January 17th, 1862, he voted against the following proposition:

"That from and after the passage of this act there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the Territories of the United States now existing, or which may at any time hereafter be formed or acquired by the United States, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

He voted, February 26, 1862, against establishing the following Article of War:

ARTICLE — All officers or persons in the military and naval service of the United States are prohibited from employing any of the forces under their respective commands for the purpose of returning fugitives from service or labor, who may have escaped from any persons to whom such service or labor is claimed to be due. Any officer who shall be found guilty by court-martial of violating this article, shall be dismissed from the service.

He voted, April 11th, 1862, against the bill for the release of certain persons held to service or labor in the District of Columbia.

He voted, May 26th, 1862, against the bill to free from servitude the slaves of rebels engaged in abetting the existing rebellion against the Government of the United States.

June 9th, 1862, he voted against the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill modifying the fugitive slave law so as to require a jury trial in all cases where the party claimed denies, under oath, that he is a slave, and also requiring any claimant under such act to prove that he has been loyal to the Government during the present rebellion.

And by many other votes of like character sustained the institution of slavery—the cause of this cruel rebellion which has drenched our country in blood.

He opposed the passage of the following resolutions:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled: 1. That the rebellion, on the part of the seceding States against the Government and laws of this Union was deliberately wicked and without reasonable cause; the compact of the Union being perpetual, no State has the constitutional power to forcibly secede, and that there was no grievance, real or imaginary, upon the part of the seceding States, for the redress of which the Constitution does not furnish ample remedies.

2. That the rebellion, being in contravention of the Constitution and laws, it is the duty of the Government to put it down, without regard to cost, or the consequences that may befall those engaged in it, and all necessary constitutional means for this purpose, and this alone should be furnished by the people. That inasmuch as the great and wicked crime invoked the power of the sword, the war should be prosecuted with all the vigor and strength and means of the Federal Government till rebellion be subdued, and no longer.

3. That an honorable peace is desirable; but no peace while armed opposition menaces the capital, and threatens the overthrow of the Union; nor that peace which would be established upon the dismembered fragments of a mighty and prosperous nation; and that man who would entertain peace upon these conditions is a traitor to his country, and unworthy the protection of its laws.

4. That the war was inaugurated solely for the suppression of the rebellion and the restoration of the Union as it was; that any and all attempts to change or divert this line of policy is a fraud upon the nation, a fraud upon the memory of the gallant men who have sacrificed their lives, and a fraud upon the living soldiers who now stand up as a wall between their loved country and its wicked invaders.

5. That the value of dollars and cents does not enter into the momentous question of the maintenance of popular liberty, or the preservation of a free Government, any more than the lives and comfort of the traitors who have conspired or leagued together for their destruction.

6. That the Union restored, the war should cease, and the seceding States be received back into the Union with all the privileges and immunities to which they were originally entitled.

He voted December 17, 1863, against the following resolutions:

Resolved, That our country, and the very existence of the best Government ever instituted by man, are imperiled by the most senseless and wicked rebellion that the world has ever seen; and believing, as we do, that the only hope of saving this country and preserving this Government is by the power of the sword, we are for the most vigorous prosecution of the war, until the Constitution and laws shall be enforced and obeyed in all parts of the United States; and to that end we oppose any armistice, or intervention, or mediation, or proposition for peace from any quarter, so long as there shall be found a rebel in arms against the

Government; and we ignore all party names, lines, and issues, and recognize but two parties in this war—patriots and traitors.

Resolved, That we hold it to be the duty of Congress to pass all necessary bills to supply men and money, and the duty of the people to render every aid in their power to the constituted authorities of the Government in the crushing out of the rebellion, and in bringing the leaders thereof to condign punishment.

This resolution was adopted by a vote of yeas 153, nays 1. The nay was Mr. Pendleton's particular friend, Benjamin G. Harris, of Maryland. *Mr. Pendleton dodged*.

December 21, 1863, when a joint resolution, providing for deficiencies in former appropriations for the army, was under consideration, Mr. Harding, of Kentucky, moved the following amendment:

Provided, That no part of the money aforesaid shall be applied to the raising, arming, equipping, or paying of negro soldiers.

The amendment was rejected by a vote of yeas 41, nays 105—Mr. Pendleton voting with the minority. The negro troops were then in actual service, so that the object of the amendment was to cheat them out of their pay, and to violate the plighted faith of the Government. Even Fernando Wood voted against this mean attempt at repudiation; but it met the approbation of Mr. Pendleton.

January 18, 1864, Mr. Smith, of Kentucky, submitted a preamble and resolution, as follows:

Whereas a most desperate, wicked, and bloody rebellion exists within the jurisdiction of the United States, and the safety and security of personal and national liberty depend upon its absolute and utter extinction: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is the political, civil, moral, and sacred duty of the people to meet it, fight it, crush it, and forever destroy it.

Mr. James C. Allen moved to lay the preamble and resolution on the table, but it failed, though Mr. Pendleton voted with him—yeas 26, nays 102.

The resolution was then adopted—yeas 112, nays 16; Mr. Pendleton voting in the negative, with Wood, Voorhees, James C. Allen, Long, Harris, of Maryland, Ancona, and other Copperheads.

February 15, 1864, Mr. Arnold submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Constitution should be so amended as to abolish slavery in the United States wherever it now exists, and to prohibit its existence in any part thereof forever.

Mr. Pendleton in the negative.

Feb. 24, 1864, Mr. Schenck submitted the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the present war, which this Government is carrying on against armed insurrectionists and others, banded together under the name of "Southern Confederacy," was brought on by a wicked and wholly unjustifiable re-

billion, and all those engaged in, or aiding, or encouraging it are public enemies, and should be treated as such.

Resolved, That this rebellion shall be effectually put down; and that, to prevent the recurrence of such rebellions in future, the causes which led to this one must be permanently removed.

Resolved, That in this struggle which is going on for the saving of our country and free government, there is no middle ground on which any good citizen or true patriot can stand; neutrality, or indifference, or anything short of a hearty support of the Government, being a crime where the question is between loyalty and treason.

The first resolution was agreed to without a count. On the second, a division was called for, and the first part adopted. The latter portion, declaring that "to prevent the recurrence of such rebellions in future, the causes which led to this one must be permanently removed," was voted upon. The yeas were 124; the nays were none. Mr. Pendleton *dodged*.

The vote was then taken upon the last resolution, which simply declares that in this struggle there is no neutral ground for an honest man to stand upon, and that every loyal citizen must stand by the Government. It was adopted, yeas, 109; nays, none. But Mr. Pendleton could not go it. He *dodged*. Even Cox voted for this and the preceding resolutions, but Mr. Pendleton, more candid and consistent in his adherence to the South, stood aloof. Too proud to vote a sentiment which was abhorrent to him, yet lacking firmness to vote against it, he *dodged*, while the facile little Cox swallowed the bitter pill. That Mr. Pendleton was present, is apparent from the fact that immediately following the vote he took the floor, and offered a resolution protesting against the arrest and punishment of his friend Vallandigham.

March 28, 1864, Mr. Stevens introduced a joint resolution submitting two amendments to the Constitution of the United States, to be acted upon by the States. The proposed amendments are as follows:

ARTICLE 1. Slavery and involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, is forever prohibited in the United States and all its Territories.

ART. 2. So much of article four, section two, as refers to the delivery up of persons held to service or labor escaping into another State, is annulled.

A motion was made to lay the proposition on the table, but it was rejected—yeas 45, nays 75. Mr. Pendleton voted to lay on the table; and, on May 31, voted against the joint resolution.

On April 9, a resolution was offered to expel Benjamin G. Harris, a Representative from the State of Maryland, for uttering the following treasonable language in that body:

The South asked you to let them live in peace. But you said you would bring them into subjection. That is not done yet; and God Almighty grant that it never may be. I hope that you will never subjugate the South.

'On the vote to expel, the yeas were 84, nays 58, Mr. Pendleton voting in the negative.

On the 14th of April, he gave a similar vote against the censure of his colleague, Mr. Long.

June 13, 1864, Mr. Pendleton voted against the army appropriation bill, as finally agreed upon by committees of conference of the two Houses.

On the same day, Mr. Pendleton voted against the repeal of the fugitive slave acts. The vote stood—yeas 90, nays 62.

June 15, 1864, Mr. Pendleton voted against the joint resolution of the Senate proposing to the States changes of the Constitution so as to prohibit slavery.

July 7, 1864, he voted against the following:

Whereas the organized treason having its headquarters at Richmond exists in defiant violation of the national Constitution, and has no claim to be treated otherwise than as an outlaw; and whereas this Richmond combination of conspirators and traitors can have no rightful authority over the people of any portion of the national Union, and no warrant for assuming control of the political destiny of the people of any State or section of this Union, and no apology but that of conspiracy and treason for any assumption of authority whatever: Therefore,

Resolved, That any proposition to negotiate with the rebel leaders at Richmond (sometimes called "the authorities at Richmond") for a restoration of loyalty and order to those portions of the Republic which have been disorganized by the rebellion is, in effect, a proposition to recognize the ringleaders of the rebellion as entitled to represent and bind the loyal citizens of the United States whom they oppress, and to give countenance and support to the pretensions of conspiracy and treason; and therefore every such proposition should be rejected without hesitation and delay.

March 3, 1864—He voted against the Senate resolutions against foreign intervention in the existing rebellion, of which resolutions the following is one:

Resolved, That the United States are now grappling with an unprovoked and wicked rebellion, which is seeking the destruction of the Republic that it may build a new Power, whose corner-stone, according to the confession of its chiefs, shall be slavery; that for the suppression of this rebellion, and thus to save the Republic and to prevent the establishment of such a Power, the national Government is now employing armies and fleets, in full faith that through these efforts all the purposes of conspirators and rebels will be crushed; that while engaged in this struggle, on which so much depends, any proposition from a foreign Power, whatever form it may take, having for its object the arrest of these efforts, is, just in proportion to its influence, an encouragement to the rebellion and to its declared pretensions, and, on this account, is calculated to prolong and embitter the conflict, to cause increased expenditure of blood and treasure, and to postpone the much desired day of peace; that, with these convictions, and not doubting that every such proposition, although made with good intent, is injurious to the national interests, Congress will be obliged to look upon any further attempt in the same direction as an unfriendly act, which it earnestly deprecates, to the end that nothing may occur abroad to strengthen the rebellion or to weaken those relations of good will with foreign Powers which the United States are happy to cultivate.

January 29, 1862, he voted against the bill to authorize the President of the United States, in certain cases, to take possession of railroads and telegraph lines, in order more effectually to carry on the war against the rebels.

December 28, 1862, he voted for the postponement of the bill making appropriations for the support of the army for the year ending 30th June, 1864, and on the same day dodged the vote on the passage of the bill.

He opposed the passage of the following resolution:

Strike out all after the word "Resolved," and insert "That this House approve of the constant, statesmanlike, and humane efforts of the Administration to secure an exchange of our prisoners now in the hands of the rebels, and that it is hereby recommended that such efforts be continued to secure an exchange of all our prisoners now in southern prisons."

And by more than a hundred votes of like character has endeavored to hinder the Government in the suppression of the rebellion.

HIS SPEECHES.

He says in a speech in the House of Representatives, January 18, 1861:

To-day, sir, four States of the Union have, as far as their power extends, seceded from it. Four States, as far as they are able, have annulled the grants of power made to the Federal Government; they have resumed the powers delegated by the Constitution; they have canceled, as far as they could, every limitation upon the full exercise of all their sovereign rights; they do not claim our protection, they ask no benefit from our laws; they seek none of the advantages of the confederation. On the other hand, they renounce their allegiance; they repudiate our authority over them; and they assert that they have assumed, some of them that they have resumed, their position among the family of sovereignties, among the nations.

Sir, I deal in no harsh epithets. I will denounce no State no body of men. I will not pause to inquire whether they have done all this legally or wisely, or upon sufficient cause. *They have done it, and I recognize the fact.* They have done it with a unanimity of sentiment, with a coincidence of opinion among the people, which is without parallel in the history of revolutions; and the simple question presented to us to-day is this: whether, throughout the limits of those States, which have thus formally, thus orderly, thus by the enactments of representative bodies of highest capacity known to the civilized nations—conventions duly authorized and properly elected to consider this very question—have declared themselves independent of us, we are prepared, by force of arms, to maintain our supremacy and enforce our laws?

Next we have Mr. Pendleton's theory of a Government with no power to enforce the laws. He recites the obligations of the Constitution in order to show that they are utterly without sanction, and that they must always remain null and void when resistance is made to them. Mr. Webster was wont to say of Mr. Calhoun's constitutional theories, that they made of the Government a "rope of sand;" but Calhoun never pushed his theory of a compact of sovereign States to quite the extreme which Mr. Pendleton has reached, as we will proceed to show. In the same speech he said:

Now, sir, what force of arms can compel a State to do that which she has agreed to do? What force of arms can compel a State to refrain from doing that which her State government, supported by the sentiment of her people, is determined to persist in doing? It is provided in the Constitution that the citizens of every State shall have all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States. What force of this Federal Government can compel the observance of that clause, if a State is determined to

pass and execute laws whereby citizens of other States shall not have, within its limits, the same privilege as its own citizens.

"Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts and judicial proceedings of every other State." How will the Federal Government, by armies and arms, enforce the observance of that clause in the Constitution, if the judiciary and the executive authorities of a State, supported by the laws refuse such faith and credit?

"No State, without the consent of Congress, shall lay any impost or duties on imports." Suppose a State should pass such a law, and the citizens were willing to execute the law, what army could prevent it?

"No State, shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign Power." I wish to know from gentlemen what number of men it would require to annul such an agreement once made. The General Government is invested with certain powers necessary to be executed, in order to keep the machinery of the Government in motion. Can any number of troops, or the use of any armed force on the part of the States, compel the General Government to execute those powers if the agents appointed for that purpose deliberately, persistently refuse to execute them? *Sir, the whole scheme of coercion is impracticable. It is contrary to the genius and spirit of the Constitution.*

Mr. Pendleton again says:

Sir, the enforcement of your laws, within a seceding State, in opposition to its will, is coercion of that State, and coercion by armed force is war. These terms, "collecting the revenue," "enforcing the law," "maintaining the Union," captivate our people. They smack of law and order, to which our people are very much attached. They are not unknown in American history. Our fathers heard them used in the same tone and spirit, and for the same purpose, as we hear them now. In 1763, when the colonies were rejoicing at the repeal of the stamp act, Charles Townsend, then a member of Lord Chatham's cabinet, pledged to conciliation and peace, rose in the House of Commons, and declared that it was expedient to collect revenues from America, and that he would himself bring in a bill to accomplish that result. His declaration was received with tumultuous shouts of applause, &c.

Mr. Pendleton says further:

My voice to-day is for conciliation; my voice is for compromise; and it is but the echo of the voice of my constituents. I beg you, gentlemen, who with me represent the northwest; you who with me represent the State of Ohio; you who with me represent the city of Cincinnati—I beg you gentlemen to hear that voice. If you will not; if you

find conciliation impossible; if your differences are so great that you cannot or will not reconcile them, then, gentlemen, let the seceding States depart in peace; let them establish their government and empire, and work out their destiny according to the wisdom which God has given them.

But we resume our extracts from Mr. Pendleton's speech. He continues:

My colleague (Mr. Stanton) said the other day that war seemed inevitable. He said the end of that war was dissolution and disunion. If he said truly, if he judged wisely, in God's name let us leap over the intervening agony of war, and come to the end and conclusion at once.

If George III. had conciliated his colonies, how much wiser a man would history have proclaimed him! If, failing to conciliate, he had allowed the separation without the disgrace and defeat of the Revolutionary war, how much wiser a man still would he have been!

MR. STANTON. I would be glad to know of my colleague if he holds that there is any power in any department of this Government to recognize the secession of a State under the Constitution. As to the matter of conciliation and compromise, the people of the seceding States say they want none, and will accept none; and, therefore, it is useless to talk of it. I again ask my colleague whether there is any power, under the Constitution, to recognize the secession of a State, and recognize it as a foreign nation.

MR. PENDLETON. What may be the constitutional power of this Government to recognize the secession of a State, I decline to discuss at present. But this I say, if we should become engaged in war with a foreign enemy, and a portion of our territory should be captured and reduced to possession by the enemy, and we should be obliged to make a treaty of peace on the basis of retaining what each party had acquired—*ut possidetis*—acknowledging the sovereignty of that territory to have passed away from us, certainly the Federal Government would have the power to conform to our restricted limits, and to confine its jurisdiction to our admitted boundaries. If war be dismemberment, as my colleague declares, has not the Federal Government as much power to treat that question now as at the end of a war? Will a conflict of arms confer constitutional power upon the Federal Government?

With this, as a part only of a long record of a similar character, we present to the American people this accusation of a man who now asks their suffrages to exalt him to the second position in their gift.

NOTE.—The above record has been carefully made up from the Journals of the House of Representatives and the *Congressional Globe*, which is the official organ of Congress; and every statement made in this pamphlet can be fully verified by a reference to them.